arXiv:1410.1333v3 [cs.IT] 2 Apr 2015

Rank-metric codes and their duality theory

Alberto Ravagnani*

Institut de Mathématiques
Université de Neuchâtel
Emile-Argand 11, CH-2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland

Abstract

We compare the two duality theories of rank-metric codes proposed by Delsarte and Gabidulin, proving that the former generalizes the latter. We also give an elementary proof of MacWilliams identities for the general case of Delsarte rank-metric codes. The identities which we derive are very easy to handle, and allow us to re-establish in a very concise way the main results of the theory of rank-metric codes first proved by Delsarte employing the theory of association schemes and regular semilattices. We also show that our identities imply as a corollary the original MacWilliams identities established by Delsarte. We describe how the minimum and maximum rank of a rank-metric code relate to the minimum and maximum rank of the dual code, giving some bounds and characterizing the codes attaining them. Then we study optimal anticodes in the rank metric, describing them in terms of optimal codes (namely, MRD codes). In particular, we prove that the dual of an optimal anticode is an optimal anticode. Finally, as an application of our results to a classical problem in enumerative combinatorics, we derive both a recursive and an explicit formula for the number of $k \times m$ matrices over a finite field with given rank and h-trace.

Introduction

In [6] Delsarte defines rank-metric codes as sets of matrices of given size over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. The distance between two matrices is given by the rank of their difference. Interpreting matrices as bilinear forms, Delsarte studies rank-metric codes as association schemes, whose adjacency algebra yields the so-called MacWilliams transform of distance enumerators of codes. The results of [6] are based on the general theory of designs and codesigns in regular semilattices developed in [5].

In [9] Gabidulin proposed a different definition of rank-metric code, in which the codewords are vectors with entries in an extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. MacWilliams identities for Gabidulin codes were obtained in [10]. As we will explain in details, one can naturally associate to any vector with entries in an extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ a matrix of prescribed size over the base field $\mathbb{F}_q$. The rank of the vector (as defined by Gabidulin) coincides with the ordinary rank of the associated matrix. Hence there exists a natural way to associate to a Gabidulin code a Delsarte code with the same metric properties. From this point of view, Gabidulin codes can be regarded as a

*E-mail: alberto.ravagnani@unine.ch. The author was partially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation through grant no. 200021_150207.

special case of Delsarte codes. It is however not clear in general how the duality theories of these two families of codes relate to each other. This is one of the questions that we address in this work.

Both linear Delsarte and Gabidulin codes have interesting applications in information theory. Recently it was shown how to employ them for error correction in non-coherent linear network coding and in coherent linear network coding under an adversarial channel model (see e.g. [21] and the references within). Rank-metric codes were also proposed to secure a network coding communication system against an eavesdropper in a universal way (see [22] for details).

Motivated by these applications, in this paper we study the duality theories of linear Delsarte and Gabidulin codes, mainly focusing on their MacWilliams identities. In coding theory, a MacWilliams identity establishes a relation between metric properties of a code and metric properties of the dual code. MacWilliams identities exist for several types of codes and metrics. As Gluesing-Luerssen observed in [12], association schemes provide the most general approach to MacWilliams identities, and apply to both linear and non-linear codes (see [4], [3] and [7]). On the other hand, the machinery of association schemes and of the related Bose-Mesner algebras is a very elaborated mathematical tool. Several authors proved independently the MacWilliams identities for the various types of codes in less sophisticated ways.

A different viewpoint on MacWilliams identities for general additive codes was recently proposed by Gluesing-Luerssen in [12]. The approach is based on character theory and partitions of groups. See also [14] for a character-theoretic approach to MacWilliams identities for the rank and the Hamming metric.

Both the theory of association schemes and the approach of [12] apply to Delsarte rank-metric codes, giving MacWilliams identities in the form presented in [6]. On the other hand, to the extent of our knowledge, there is no elementary proof for them.

Let us briefly describe the content of the paper. We start comparing the duality theories of Delsarte and Gabidulin codes, proving that the former generalize the latter. Then we give a short proof of MacWilliams identities for the general case of Delsarte rank-metric codes. We only employ elementary properties of the rank metric, linear algebra techniques and a double counting argument, avoiding any sort of numerical calculation. The identities which we derive have a very convenient form, which allows us to re-establish the most important results of the theory of rank-metric codes in a concise way. We also show that the original MacWilliams identities proved by Delsarte in [6] can be easily obtained from our identities. In a second part we prove some bounds that relate the minimum and maximum rank of a code to the minimum and maximum rank of the dual code, characterizing the codes which attain them. The bounds show that also the maximum rank of a code (and not only the minimum rank) deserves interest. We also investigate anticodes in the rank metric, and present a new characterization of optimal anticodes in terms of optimal codes. Then we apply such characterization to show that the dual of an optimal anticode is an optimal anticode. This result may be regarded as the analogue for anticodes of the fact that the dual of an optimal code is an optimal code. Finally, as an application of our results to a classical problem in enumerative combinatorics, we give both a recursive and an explicit formula for the number of rectangular matrices with given rank and h-trace over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. To the extent of our knowledge, formulas of this type are not available in the literature.

The layout of the paper is as follows. Section 1 contains some preliminaries on Delsarte rank-metric codes. In Section 2 we compare Delsarte and Gabidulin codes. In Section 3 we give an elementary proof for MacWilliams identities for the general case of Delsarte rank-metric

codes, and use them to establish the main results of the theory of these codes. In Section 4 and in the last part of Section 5 we study how the minimum and the maximum rank of a rank-metric code relate to the minimum and maximum rank of the dual code, proving some bounds on the involved parameters and characterizing the codes which attain them. Optimal anticodes in the rank metric are studied in Section 5. In Section 6 we derive a recursive formula for the number of rectangular matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of given rank and h-trace. In Appendix A we show how our results relate to the original work by Delsarte, giving in particular an explicit formula for the number of rectangular matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of given rank and h-trace.

1 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, q denotes a fixed prime power, and $\mathbb{F}_q$ the finite field with q elements. We also work with positive integers k and m.

Notation 1. We denote by $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ the $\mathbb{F}_q$-vector space of $k \times m$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{F}_q$. Given a matrix $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$, we write $\mathrm{Tr}(M)$ for the trace of M, and M_i for the i-th column of M, i.e., the vector $(M_{1i}, M_{2i}, ..., M_{ki})^t \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$. The transpose of M is M^t, while $\mathrm{rk}(M)$ denotes the rank of M. The vector space generated by the columns of a matrix $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is $\mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$. When the size is clear from the context, we denote a zero matrix simply by 0.

Let us briefly recall the setup of [6].

Definition 2. The **trace product** of matrices $M, N \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is denoted and defined by

$$\langle M, N \rangle := \mathrm{Tr}(MN^t).$$

It is easy to check that the map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q) \times \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathbb{F}_q$ is a scalar product (i.e., symmetric, bilinear and non-degenerate).

Definition 3. A (**Delsarte rank-metric**) **code** of size $k \times m$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear subspace $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. The **minimum rank** of a non-zero code $\mathcal{C}$ is denoted and defined by $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}) := \min\{\mathrm{rk}(M) : M \in \mathcal{C},\ \mathrm{rk}(M) > 0\}$, while the **maximum rank** of any code $\mathcal{C}$ is denoted and defined by $\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}) := \max\{\mathrm{rk}(M) : M \in \mathcal{C}\}$. The **dual** of $\mathcal{C}$ is the Delsarte code $\mathcal{C}^\perp := \{N \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q) : \langle M, N \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } M \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

Remark 4. We notice that Delsarte codes are by definition linear over $\mathbb{F}_q$, and that linearity is a crucial property for the results presented in this paper.

The following lemma summarizes some straightforward properties of duality.

Lemma 5. Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be codes. We have:

- $(\mathcal{C}^\perp)^\perp = \mathcal{C}$;
- $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = km - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C})$;
- $(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D})^\perp = \mathcal{C}^\perp + \mathcal{D}^\perp$, and $(\mathcal{C} + \mathcal{D})^\perp = \mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathcal{D}^\perp$.

Recall that for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ the standard inner product of vectors $(x_1, ..., x_n), (y_1, ..., y_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is defined by $(x_1, ..., x_n) \cdot (y_1, ..., y_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$. It is easy to see that the trace product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and the standard inner product on $\mathbb{F}_q^k$ relate as follows.

Lemma 6. Let $M, N \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. We have $\langle M, N \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{m} M_i \cdot N_i$.

Notation 7. Lemma 6 says that the trace product of two matrices is the sum of the standard inner products of the columns of the two matrices. In particular, the trace product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times 1, \mathbb{F}_q) \cong \mathbb{F}_q^k$ coincides with the standard inner product on $\mathbb{F}_q^k$. Hence from now on we denote both products by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We also denote by $U^\perp$ the dual of a vector subspace $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$, i.e., $U^\perp := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^k : \langle u, x \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } u \in U\}$.

The following result, first proved by Delsarte, is well-known.

Theorem 8 ([6], Theorem 5.4)**.** Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a non-zero code, and let $d := \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})$. We have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \max\{k, m\}(\min\{k, m\} - d + 1).$$

Moreover, for any $1 \leq d \leq \min\{k, m\}$ there exists a non-zero code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ of minimum rank d which attains the upper bound.

Definition 9. A code attaining the bound of Theorem 8 is said to be an **optimal** or **maximum rank distance** code (**MRD** code in short). The zero code will be also considered MRD.

Remark 10. Notice that $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is a trivial example of an MRD code with minimum rank 1 and dimension km. See [6], Section 6, for the construction of codes attaining the bound of Theorem 8 for any choice of the parameters.

Definition 11. Given a code $\mathcal{C}$ and an integer $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ define $A_i(\mathcal{C}) := |\{M \in \mathcal{C} : \mathrm{rk}(M) = i\}|$. The collection $(A_i(\mathcal{C}))_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}}$ is said to be the **rank distribution** of $\mathcal{C}$.

Remark 12. The minimum rank of a non-zero code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is the smallest $i > 0$ such that $A_i(\mathcal{C}) > 0$. Notice that we define $A_i(\mathcal{C})$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$, even if we clearly have $A_i(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ for all integers $i > \min\{k, m\}$. This choice will simplify the statements in the sequel.

2 Delsarte and Gabidulin rank-metric codes

A different definition of rank-metric code, proposed by Gabidulin, is the following.

Definition 13 (see [9])**.** Let $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field extension. A **Gabidulin** (**rank-metric**) **code** of length k over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ is an $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-linear subspace $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$. The **rank** of a vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ is defined as $\mathrm{rk}(\alpha) := \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathrm{Span}\{\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_k\}$. The **minimum rank** of a Gabidulin code $C \neq 0$ is $\mathrm{minrk}(C) := \min\{\mathrm{rk}(\alpha) : \alpha \in C,\ \alpha \neq 0\}$, and the **maximum rank** of any Gabidulin code C is $\mathrm{maxrk}(C) := \max\{\mathrm{rk}(\alpha) : \alpha \in C\}$. The **rank distribution** of C is the collection $(A_i(C))_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}}$, where $A_i(C) := |\{\alpha \in C : \mathrm{rk}(\alpha) = i\}|$. The **dual** of a Gabidulin code C is denoted and defined by $C^\perp := \{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k : \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in C\}$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard inner product of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$.

It is natural to ask how Gabidulin and Delsarte codes relate to each other.

Definition 14. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_m\}$ be a basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$. The matrix **associated** to a vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ is the $k \times m$ matrix $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$ with entries in $\mathbb{F}_q$ defined by $\alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} M_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)_{ij} \gamma_j$ for all $i = 1, ..., k$. The Delsarte code **associated** to a Gabidulin code $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ with respect to the basis $\mathcal{G}$ is $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C) := \{M_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) : \alpha \in C\} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$.

Notice that, in the previous definition, the i-th row of $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$ is just the expansion of the entry α_i over the basis $\mathcal{G}$. The following result is immediate and well-known. We include it here for completeness.

Proposition 15. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ be a Gabidulin code. For any basis $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is a Delsarte rank-metric code with

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C) = m \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}}(C).$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)$ has the same rank distribution as C. In particular we have $\mathrm{maxrk}(C) = \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C))$, and if $C \neq 0$ then $\mathrm{minrk}(C) = \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C))$.

Remark 16. Proposition 15 shows that any Gabidulin code can be regarded as a Delsarte rank-metric code with the same cardinality and rank distribution. Clearly, since Gabidulin codes are $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-linear spaces and Delsarte codes are $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear spaces, not all Delsarte rank-metric codes arise from a Gabidulin code in this way. In fact, only a few of them do. For example, a Delsarte code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \not\equiv 0 \mod m$ cannot arise from a Gabidulin code.

In the remainder of the section we compare the duality theories of Delsarte and Gabidulin codes, proving in particular that the former generalizes the latter.

Remark 17. Given a Gabidulin code $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ and a basis $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$, it is natural to ask whether the Delsarte codes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C^\perp)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)^\perp$ coincide or not. The answer is unfortunately negative in general, as we show in the following example.

Example 18. Let $q = 3$, $k = m = 2$ and $\mathbb{F}_{3^2} = \mathbb{F}_3[\eta]$, where η is a root of the irreducible primitive polynomial $x^2 + 2x + 2 \in \mathbb{F}_3[x]$. Let $\xi := \eta^2$, so that $\xi^2 + 1 = 0$. Set $\alpha := (\xi, 2)$, and let $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{3^2}^2$ be the 1-dimensional Gabidulin code generated by α over $\mathbb{F}_{3^2}$. Take $\mathcal{G} := \{1, \xi\}$ as basis of $\mathbb{F}_{3^2}$ over $\mathbb{F}_3$. One can easily check that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(2 \times 2, \mathbb{F}_3)$ is generated over $\mathbb{F}_3$ by the two matrices

$$M_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad M_{\mathcal{G}}(\xi\alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\beta := (\xi, 1) \in \mathbb{F}_{3^2}^2$. We have $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = 1 \neq 0$, and so $\beta \notin C^\perp$. It follows $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta) \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C^\perp)$. On the other hand,

$$M_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and it is easy to see that $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta)$ is trace-orthogonal to both $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$ and $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\xi\alpha)$. It follows $M_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)^\perp$, and so $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)^\perp \neq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C^\perp)$.

Although, for a fixed basis $\mathcal{G}$, the duality notions for Delsarte and Gabidulin codes do not coincide in general, we show that there is a simple relation between them via orthogonal bases of finite fields.

Definition 19. Let $\mathrm{Trace} : \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \to \mathbb{F}_q$ be the $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear **trace** map given by $\mathrm{Trace}(\alpha) := \alpha + \alpha^q + \cdots + \alpha^{q^{m-1}}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Bases $\mathcal{G} = \{\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_m\}$ and $\mathcal{G}' = \{\gamma'_1, ..., \gamma'_m\}$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ are said to be **orthogonal** (or **dual**) if $\mathrm{Trace}(\gamma'_i \gamma_j) = \delta_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, ..., m\}$.

The following result on orthogonal bases is well-known.

Proposition 20 ([19], page 54)**.** For every basis $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ there exists a unique orthogonal basis $\mathcal{G}'$.

Theorem 21. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ be a Gabidulin code, and let $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{G}'$ be orthogonal bases of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$. We have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}'}(C^\perp) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)^\perp.$$

In particular, if we set $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)$, then C has the same rank distribution as $\mathcal{C}$, and $C^\perp$ has the same rank distribution as $\mathcal{C}^\perp$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_m\}$ and $\mathcal{G}' = \{\gamma'_1, ..., \gamma'_m\}$. Take any $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}'}(C^\perp)$ and $N \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)$. There exist $\alpha \in C^\perp$ and $\beta \in C$ such that $M = M_{\mathcal{G}'}(\alpha)$ and $N = M_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta)$. According to Definition 14 we have

$$0 = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \beta_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} M_{ij} \gamma'_j \sum_{t=1}^{m} N_{it} \gamma_t = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m} M_{ij} N_{it} \gamma'_j \gamma_t. \tag{1}$$

Applying the function $\mathrm{Trace} : \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \to \mathbb{F}_q$ to both sides of equation (1) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathrm{Trace}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m} M_{ij} N_{it} \gamma'_j \gamma_t \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m} M_{ij} N_{it} \mathrm{Trace}(\gamma'_j \gamma_t) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m} M_{ij} N_{it} \delta_{jt} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} M_{ij} N_{ij} \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}(M N^t) \\
&= \langle M, N \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}'}(C^\perp) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)^\perp$. By Proposition 15 and Lemma 5, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}'}(C^\perp)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C)^\perp$ have the same dimension over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Hence the two codes are equal. The second part of the statement easily follows from Proposition 15. □

Remark 22. Theorem 21 shows that the duality theory of Delsarte rank-metric codes can be regarded as a generalization of the duality theory of Gabidulin rank-metric codes. In particular, we notice that all the results on Delsarte codes which we will prove in the following sections also apply to Gabidulin codes. Note that a relation between the trace-product of $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and the standard inner product of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ involving orthogonal bases was also pointed out in [13].

In the remainder of the paper we focus on the general case of Delsarte rank-metric codes.

3 MacWilliams identities for rank-metric codes

In this section we give an elementary proof of certain MacWilliams identities for Delsarte rank-metric codes. MacWilliams identities for such codes were also obtained in [6] by Delsarte himself using the machinery of association schemes. The formulas which we derive are different from those of [6], but are significantly more straightforward. Indeed, the proof that we present is elementary and concise, and only employs linear algebra and a double counting argument. In Appendix A we also show how the original formulas by Delsarte can be obtained from our formulas as a corollary. A different formulation of the identities of [6] can be found in [11].

Definition 23. Let q be a prime power, and let s and t be integers. The q-**binomial coefficient** of s and t is denoted and defined by

$$\begin{bmatrix} s \\ t \end{bmatrix}_q = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s<0,\ t<0, \text{ or } t>s, \\ 1 & \text{if } t=0 \text{ and } s\geq 0, \\ \prod_{i=1}^{t} \frac{q^{s-i+1}-1}{q^i-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is well-known that this number counts the number of t-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_q$-subspaces of an s-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_q$-space. In particular we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} s \\ t \end{bmatrix}_q = \begin{bmatrix} s \\ s-t \end{bmatrix}_q$$

for all integers s, t. Since in this paper we work with a fixed prime power q, we omit the subscript in the sequel.

Remark 24. Given any matrices $M, N \in \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ we always have $\mathrm{colsp}(M+N) \subseteq \mathrm{colsp}(M)+\mathrm{colsp}(N)$. As a consequence, if $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$ is a vector subspace, then the set of matrices $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with $\mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq U$ is a vector subspace of $\mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$.

Notation 25. We denote the vector space $\{M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q) : \mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq U\}$ of Remark 24 by $\mathrm{Mat}_U(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$.

We start with a series of preliminary results.

Lemma 26. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$ be a subspace. We have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathrm{Mat}_U(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q) = m \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U)$.

Proof. Let $s := \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U)$. Define the s-dimensional space $V := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^k : x_i = 0 \text{ for } i > s\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$. There exists an $\mathbb{F}_q$-isomorphism $g : \mathbb{F}_q^k \to \mathbb{F}_q^k$ that maps U into V. Let $G \in \mathrm{Mat}(k\times k, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be the invertible matrix associated to g with respect to the canonical basis $\{e_1, ..., e_k\}$ of $\mathbb{F}_q^k$, i.e.,

$$g(e_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} G_{ij} e_i \qquad \text{for all } j = 1, ..., k.$$

For any matrix $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ we have $g(\mathrm{colsp}(M)) = \mathrm{colsp}(GM)$, and it is easy to check that the map $M \mapsto GM$ is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-isomorphism $\mathrm{Mat}_U(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathrm{Mat}_V(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. Now we observe that $\mathrm{Mat}_V(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is the vector space of matrices $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ whose last $k-s$ rows equal zero. Hence $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathrm{Mat}_V(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q) = km - m(k-s) = ms$, and the lemma follows. ∎

Lemma 27. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$ be a subspace. We have $\mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)^\perp = \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$.

Proof. Let $N \in \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and $M \in \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. By definition, each column of N belongs to $U^\perp$, and each column of M belongs to U. Hence by Lemma 6 we have

$$\langle M, N \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle M_i, N_i \rangle = 0.$$

This proves $\mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)^\perp$. By Lemma 26, the two spaces of matrices $\mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)^\perp$ have the same dimension over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Hence they are equal. □

Lemma 28. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code, and let $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$ be a subspace. Denote by s the dimension of U over $\mathbb{F}_q$. We have

$$|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{q^{m(k-s)}} |\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)|.$$

Proof. Combining Lemma 5 and Lemma 27 we obtain

$$(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q))^\perp = \mathcal{C}^\perp + \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)^\perp = \mathcal{C}^\perp + \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q).$$

Hence by Lemma 5 we have

$$|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| \cdot |\mathcal{C}^\perp + \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = q^{km}. \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, Lemma 26 gives

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp + \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) + m \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} U^\perp - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)),$$

and so, again by Lemma 5,

$$|\mathcal{C}^\perp + \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = \frac{q^{km} \cdot q^{m(k-s)}}{|\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)|}. \tag{3}$$

Combining equation (2) and equation (3) one easily obtains the lemma. □

The following result is well-known, but we include it for completeness.

Lemma 29. Let $0 \leq t, s \leq k$ be integers, and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$ be a subspace of dimension t over $\mathbb{F}_q$. The number of subspaces $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k$ such that $X \subseteq U$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U) = s$ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} k-t \\ s-t \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Let $\pi : \mathbb{F}_q^k \to \mathbb{F}_q^k / X$ denote the projection on the quotient vector space $\mathbb{F}_q^k$ modulo X. It is easy to see that π induces a bijection between the s-dimensional vector subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^k$ containing X and the $(s-t)$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^k / X$. The lemma follows from the fact that $\mathbb{F}_q^k / X$ has dimension $k - t$. □

Lemma 30. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code. Denote by $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$. Let $0 \leq s \leq k$ be an integer. We have

$$\sum_{\substack{U\subseteq\mathbb{F}_q^k \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U)=s}} |\mathcal{C} \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ k-s \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Define the set $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{C}, s) := \{(U, M) : U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k,\ \dim(U) = s,\ M \in \mathcal{C},\ \mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq U\}$. We will count the elements of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{C}, s)$ in two different ways. On the one hand, using Lemma 29, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{C}, s)| &= \sum_{M\in\mathcal{C}} |\{U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k,\ \dim(U) = s,\ \mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq U\}| \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \sum_{\substack{M\in\mathcal{C} \\ \mathrm{rk}(M)=i}} |\{U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^k,\ \dim(U) = s,\ \mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq U\}| \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \sum_{\substack{M\in\mathcal{C} \\ \mathrm{rk}(M)=i}} \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ s-i \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ s-i \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ k-s \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{C}, s)| = \sum_{\substack{U\subseteq\mathbb{F}_q^k \\ \dim(U)=s}} |\{M \in \mathcal{C} : \mathrm{colsp}(M) \subseteq U\}| = \sum_{\substack{U\subseteq\mathbb{F}_q^k \\ \dim(U)=s}} |\mathcal{C} \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)|,$$

and the lemma follows. □

Now we state our main result.

Theorem 31. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code. Let $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the rank distributions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, respectively. For any integer $0 \leq \nu \leq k$ we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-\nu} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{q^{m\nu}} \sum_{j=0}^{\nu} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ \nu-j \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Lemma 30 applied to $\mathcal{C}$ with $s = k - \nu$ gives

$$\sum_{\substack{U\subseteq\mathbb{F}_q^k \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U)=k-\nu}} |\mathcal{C} \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ \nu \end{bmatrix}.$$

The map $U \mapsto U^\perp$ is a bijection between the ν-dimensional and the $(k-\nu)$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^k$. Hence we have

$$\sum_{\substack{U\subseteq\mathbb{F}_q^k \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U)=k-\nu}} |\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathrm{Mat}_{U^\perp}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = \sum_{\substack{U\subseteq\mathbb{F}_q^k \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U)=\nu}} |\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathrm{Mat}_U(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)| = \sum_{j=0}^{k} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ k-\nu \end{bmatrix},$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 30 applied to the code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ with $s = \nu$. Lemma 28 with $s = k - \nu$ gives

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{q^{m\nu}} \sum_{j=0}^{k} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ \nu-j \end{bmatrix}.$$

By definition, for $i > k - \nu$ and for $j > \nu$ we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ \nu-j \end{bmatrix} = 0,$$

and the theorem follows. □

Remark 32. Theorem 31 can be regarded as the q-analog of Lemma 2.2 of [17], which yields analogous identities for the Hamming metric.

Theorem 31 produces in particular MacWilliams-type identities that relate the rank distribution of a dual code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ to the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$. The following result gives a recursive method to compute the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ from the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$.

Corollary 33. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code. Let $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the rank distributions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, respectively. For $\nu = 0, ..., k$ define

$$a_\nu^k := \frac{q^{m\nu}}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{i=0}^{k-\nu} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ \nu \end{bmatrix}.$$

The B_j's are given by the recursive formula

$$\begin{cases} B_0 = 1, \\ B_\nu = a_\nu^k - \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ \nu-j \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } \nu = 1, ..., k, \\ B_\nu = 0 \quad \text{for } \nu > k. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Clearly, $B_0 = 1$ and $B_\nu = 0$ for $\nu > k$. For any fixed integer $\nu \in \{1, ..., k\}$ Theorem 31 gives

$$a_\nu^k = \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ \nu-j \end{bmatrix} + B_\nu,$$

which proves the result. □

Remark 34. Identities in the form of Theorem 31 are usually called "moments of MacWilliams identities" rather than "MacWilliams identities". For convenience, in this paper we will call "MacWilliams identities" both the identities of Theorem 31 and Corollary 33.

Remark 35. We notice that Theorem 31 implies Theorem 3.3 of [6] as a corollary (see Appendix A for details), producing MacWilliams identities for Delsarte codes in an explicit form employing an elementary argument.

Remark 36. Identities in the form of Theorem 31 were recently proved for Gabidulin codes (see [10], Proposition 3). The proof of [10] is based on the Hadamard transform, q-products, q-derivatives and q-transforms of polynomials. In [11], Corollary 1 and Proposition 3, the authors show that such identities also apply to Delsarte codes. Their proof is based on the results of [6] by Delsarte.

Theorem 31 and Corollary 33 allow us to re-establish the main results of the duality theory of rank-metric codes in a very concise way.

Corollary 37. The rank distribution of a code $\mathcal{C}$ determines the rank distribution of the dual code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$.

Proof. This immediately follows from Corollary 33. □

Remark 38. Corollary 37 was first proved by Delsarte using the theory of association schemes. See [6], Theorem 3.3 for details.

Example 39. Let $q = 3$, $k = 3$, $m = 4$. Consider the code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(3 \times 4, \mathbb{F}_3)$ generated by the following three matrices:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be checked that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_3} \mathcal{C} = 3$ and that the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$ is $A_0 = 1$, $A_1 = 2$, $A_2 = 0$, $A_3 = 24$. If $(B_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, then the recursive formula of Corollary 33 allows us to compute:

$$B_0 = 1, \quad B_1 = 50, \quad B_2 = 3432, \quad B_3 = 16200.$$

Notice that $\sum_{i=0}^{3} B_i = 19683 = 3^9 = |\mathcal{C}^\perp|$, as expected.

Remark 40. For a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ define $\mathcal{C}^t := \{M^t : M \in \mathcal{C}\} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(m \times k, \mathbb{F}_q)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^t$ have the same dimension and rank distribution. Moreover, one can check that $(\mathcal{C}^t)^\perp = (\mathcal{C}^\perp)^t$. As a consequence, up to a transposition, without loss of generality in the sequel we will always assume $k \leq m$ in the proofs of our results.

Corollary 41. If a code $\mathcal{C}$ is MRD, then $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ is also MRD.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be MRD. If $\mathcal{C} = \{0\}$ or $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ the result follows from Definition 9 and Remark 10. Hence we assume $0 < \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) < km$. Assume $k \leq m$ without loss of generality. Denote by d the minimum rank of $\mathcal{C}$, so that $|\mathcal{C}| = q^{m(k-d+1)}$. Let $(A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the rank distributions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, respectively. We have $A_0 = B_0 = 1$ and $A_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Theorem 31 with $\nu = k - d + 1$ gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-d+1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-d+1 \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-d+1} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ k-d+1-j \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-d+1} B_j \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ k-d+1-j \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Since $d \geq 1$, for $1 \leq j \leq k-d+1$ we have $k-j \geq k-d+1-j \geq 0$, and so $\begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ k-d+1-j \end{bmatrix} > 0$. Hence it must be $B_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq k-d+1$, i.e., $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \geq k-d+2$. On the other hand, Theorem 8 gives $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = m(d-1) \leq m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)+1)$, i.e., $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \leq k-d+2$. It follows $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = k-d+2$, and so $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ is MRD. □

Remark 42. Corollary 41 was first proved by Delsarte using the theory of designs and codesigns in regular semilattices ([6], Theorem 5.5). Theorem 31 allows us to give a short proof for the same result. Notice also that, by Remark 22, Corollary 41 generalizes the analogous result for Gabidulin codes of [9].

4 Minimum and maximum rank of a code

In this section we investigate the minimum and the maximum rank of a Delsarte code $\mathcal{C}$, and show how they relate to the minimum and maximum rank of its dual code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. As an application, we give a recursive formula for the rank distribution of an MRD code.

Proposition 43. Let $\mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a non-zero code. We have

$$\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \leq \min\{k,m\} - \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}) + 2.$$

Moreover, the bound is attained if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is MRD.

Proof. Assume $k \leq m$ without loss of generality. Theorem 8 applied to the code $\mathcal{C}$ gives $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \leq m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})+1)$. The same theorem applied to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ gives $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \leq m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)+1)$, i.e., $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \geq m(\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)-1)$. Hence we have

$$m(\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)-1) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \leq m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})+1). \tag{4}$$

In particular, $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) - 1 \leq k - \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}) + 1$, and the bound follows. Let us prove the second part of the statement. Assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is MRD, and let $d := \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})$. We have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) = m(k-d+1)$, and so $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = m(d-1)$. By Corollary 41, $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ is also MRD, and so $m(d-1) = m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)+1)$. It follows $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = k-d+2$. On the other hand, if $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = k - \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}) + 2$ then both the inequalities in (4) are in fact equalities, and so $\mathcal{C}$ is MRD. □

Corollary 44. The rank distribution of a non-zero MRD code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ only depends on k, m and $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof. Assume $k \leq m$ without loss of generality. Let $d := \mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})$, and let $(A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$. By Proposition 43, $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ has minimum rank $k-d+2$. Hence the equations of Theorem 31 for $0 \leq \nu \leq k-d$ reduce to

$$\begin{bmatrix} k \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=d}^{k-\nu} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{q^{m\nu}} \begin{bmatrix} k \\ \nu \end{bmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq \nu \leq k-d.$$

These identities give a linear system of $k-d+1$ equations in the $k-d+1$ unknowns $A_d, ..., A_k$. It is easy to see that the matrix associated to the system is triangular with all 1's on the diagonal. In particular, the solution to the system is unique. Hence $A_d, ..., A_k$ are uniquely determined by k, m and d. Since $A_0 = 1$ and $A_i = 0$ for $0 < i < d$ and for $i > k$, the thesis follows. □

Remark 45. Corollary 44 was first proved by Delsarte by computing explicitly the rank distribution of an MRD code, and then observing that the obtained formulas only depend on the parameters m, k, d (see [6], Theorem 5.6). Corollary 44 allows us to give a concise proof for the same result. The rank distribution of Delsarte MRD codes was also computed in [8] employing elementary techniques.

Remark 46. Using the same argument as Corollary 33 it is easy to derive a recursive formula for the rank distribution $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of a non-zero MRD code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ of given minimum rank d:

$$\begin{cases} A_0 = 1, \quad A_d = (q^m-1)\begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-d \end{bmatrix}, \\ A_{d+\ell} = (q^{m(1+\ell)}-1)\begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-d-\ell \end{bmatrix} - \sum_{i=d}^{d+\ell-1} A_i \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ k-d-\ell \end{bmatrix} \qquad \text{for } 1 \le \ell \le k-d. \end{cases}$$

We do not go into the details of the proof.

The following result is the analogue of Theorem 8 for the maximum rank.

Proposition 47. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code. We have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \le \max\{k,m\}\cdot \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Moreover, for any choice of $0 \le D \le \min\{k,m\}$ there exists a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with maximum rank equal to D and attaining the upper bound.

Proof. Assume $k \le m$ without loss of generality. Fix $0 \le D \le k$. The set of all $k\times m$ matrices having the last $k-D$ rows equal to zero is an example of a code of maximum rank D and dimension mD over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Now we prove the first part of the statement. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code with $\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}) = D$. If $D = k$ then the bound is trivial. Hence we assume $D \le k-1$. Theorem 8 gives a code $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}) = D+1$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{D}) = m(k-D)$. We clearly have $\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{D} = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}\oplus\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. Hence $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \le km - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{D}) = mD$. □

Definition 48. A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ which attains the upper bound of Proposition 47 is said to be a (**Delsarte**) **optimal anticode**.

We conclude the section with a result that relates the minimum rank of a code with the maximum rank of the dual code.

Proposition 49. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k\times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a non-zero code. We have

$$\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C}) \le \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) + 1.$$

Proof. Assume $k \le m$ without loss of generality. Applying Theorem 8 to $\mathcal{C}$ we obtain $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \le m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})+1)$, while Proposition 47 applied to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ gives $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \le m\cdot\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$, i.e., $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \ge m(k-\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp))$. Hence we have

$$m(k-\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)) \le \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \le m(k-\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{C})+1),$$

and the thesis follows. □

5 Optimal anticodes

In this section we provide a new characterization of optimal anticodes in terms of their intersection with MRD codes. As an application of such a description, we prove that the dual of an optimal anticode is an optimal anticode.

Let us first briefly recall some notions which we will need in the sequel. See [19], Section 3.4 for details.

Definition 50. Let $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field extension. A **linearized polynomial** p over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ is a polynomial of the form

$$p(x) = \alpha_0 x + \alpha_1 x^q + \alpha_2 x^{q^2} + \cdots + \alpha_s x^{q^s}, \qquad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}, \quad i = 0, ..., s.$$

The **degree** of p, denoted by $\deg(p)$, is the largest $i \geq 0$ such that $\alpha_i \neq 0$.

Remark 51. It is well known ([19], Theorem 3.50) that the roots of a linearized polynomial p over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ form an $\mathbb{F}_q$-vector subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, which we denote by $V(p) \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Notice that for any linearized polynomial p we have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} V(p) \leq \deg(p)$.

Lemma 52. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a non-zero MRD code with minimum rank d, and let $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$. Then $A_{d+\ell} > 0$ for all $0 \leq \ell \leq \min\{k, m\} - d$.

Proof. Assume $k \leq m$ without loss of generality. By Corollary 44, we shall prove the lemma for a given MRD code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ of our choice with minimum rank d. We first construct a convenient MRD code with the prescribed parameters, and we essentially follow the construction of [9].

Let $\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}, k-d)$ the $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-vector space of linearized polynomials over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ of degree less than or equal to $k-d$. We have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}, k-d) = k-d+1$. Let $ev : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}, k-d) \to \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ be the evaluation map defined by $ev(p) := (p(\gamma_1), ..., p(\gamma_k))$ for any $p \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}, k-d)$. Then the image of ev is a Gabidulin code $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ with minimum rank d and dimension $k-d+1$ over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ ([15], Theorem 14). Let $\mathcal{G}$ be any basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$. By Proposition 15, $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(C) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is a Delsarte rank-metric code with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) = m(k-d+1)$ and the same rank distribution as C. In particular, $\mathcal{C}$ is a non-zero MRD code with minimum rank d.

Now we prove the lemma for the MRD code $\mathcal{C}$ that we constructed. Fix $0 \leq \ell \leq k-d$. Define $t := k-d-\ell$, and let $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be the $\mathbb{F}_q$-subspace generated by $\{\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_t\}$. If $t = 0$ we set U to be the zero space. By [19], Theorem 3.52,

$$p_U := \prod_{\beta \in U} (x - \beta) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x]$$

is a linearized polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ of degree $t = k-d-\ell \leq k-d$. Hence $p_U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}, k-d)$. By Proposition 15 it suffices to prove that $ev(p_U) = (p_U(\gamma_1), ..., p_U(\gamma_k))$ has rank $d+\ell = k-t$. Clearly, $V(p_U) = U$. In particular we have $ev(p_U) = (0, ..., 0, p_U(\gamma_{t+1}), ..., p_U(\gamma_k))$. We will prove that $p_U(\gamma_{t+1}), ..., p_U(\gamma_k)$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Assume that there exist $a_{t+1}, ..., a_k \in \mathbb{F}_q$ such that $\sum_{i=t+1}^k a_i p_U(\gamma_i) = 0$. Then we have $p_U\left(\sum_{i=t+1}^k a_i\gamma_i\right) = 0$, i.e., $\sum_{i=t+1}^k a_i\gamma_i \in V(p_U) = U$. It follows that there exist $a_1, ..., a_t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^t a_i\gamma_i = \sum_{i=t+1}^k a_i\gamma_i$, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^t a_i\gamma_i - \sum_{i=t+1}^k a_i\gamma_i = 0$. Since $\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_q$, we have $a_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, ..., k$. In particular $a_i = 0$ for $i = t+1, ..., k$. Hence $p_U(\gamma_{t+1}), ..., p_U(\gamma_k)$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_q$, as claimed. ∎

In the following result we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a Delsarte code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \equiv 0 \mod m$ to be an optimal anticode.

Proposition 53. Let $0 \leq D \leq \min\{k, m\} - 1$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be an $\mathbb{F}_q$-subspace with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) = \max\{k, m\} \cdot D$. The following facts are equivalent.

1. $\mathcal{C}$ is an optimal anticode.
2. $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D} = \{0\}$ for all non-zero MRD codes $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}) = D + 1$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{C}$ is an optimal anticode, then by Definition 48 we have $D = \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C})$. Hence if $\mathcal{D}$ is any non-zero code with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}) = D + 1$ we clearly have $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D} = \{0\}$. So (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is trivial. Let us prove (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). By contradiction, assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is not an optimal anticode. Since $\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}) \geq D$ (see Proposition 47), we must have $s := \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}) \geq D + 1$. Let $N \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\mathrm{rk}(N) = s$. Let $\mathcal{D}'$ be a non-zero MRD code with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}') = D + 1$ (see Theorem 8 for the existence of such a code). By Lemma 52 there exists $A \in \mathcal{D}'$ with $\mathrm{rk}(A) = s$. There exist invertible matrices P and Q of size $k \times k$ and $m \times m$ (respectively) such that $N = PAQ$. Define $\mathcal{D} := P\mathcal{D}'Q := \{PMQ : M \in \mathcal{D}'\}$. Then $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is a non-zero MRD code with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}) = D + 1$ and such that $N \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}$. Since $\mathrm{rk}(N) = s \geq D + 1 \geq 1$, N cannot be the zero matrix. This contradicts the hypothesis. □

The following result may be regarded as the analogue of Corollary 41 for anticodes in the rank metric.

Theorem 54. If $\mathcal{C}$ is an optimal anticode, then $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ is also an optimal anticode.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be an optimal anticode with $D := \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C})$. Assume $k \leq m$ without loss of generality. If $D = k$ then the result is trivial. Hence from now on we assume $0 \leq D \leq k - 1$. By Definition 48 we have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) = mD$, and so $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = m(k - D)$. By Proposition 53 it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathcal{D} = \{0\}$ for all non-zero MRD codes $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}) = k - D + 1$. If $\mathcal{D}$ is such an MRD code, then we have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{D}) = m(k - (k - D + 1) + 1) = mD < mk$. Hence, by Proposition 43, $\mathcal{D}^\perp$ is an MRD code with $\mathrm{minrk}(\mathcal{D}^\perp) = k - (k - D + 1) + 2 = D + 1$. Proposition 53 gives $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}^\perp = \{0\}$. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{D}^\perp) = mD + m(k - (D + 1) + 1) = mk$, it follows $\mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{D}^\perp = \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. Hence by Lemma 5 we have $\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap \mathcal{D} = \{0\}$, as claimed. □

The following result shows how the maximum rank of a code $\mathcal{C}$ and the maximum rank of the dual code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ relate to each other.

Proposition 55. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code. We have

$$\mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}) \geq \min\{k, m\} - \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp).$$

Moreover, the bound is attained if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is an optimal anticode.

Proof. Assume $k \leq m$ without loss of generality. Proposition 47 applied to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ gives $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \leq m \cdot \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$, i.e., $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \geq m(k - \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp))$. The same proposition applied to $\mathcal{C}$ gives $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \leq m \cdot \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C})$. Hence we have

$$m(k - \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{C}) \leq m \cdot \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}). \tag{5}$$

In particular, $k - \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \leq \mathrm{maxrk}(\mathcal{C})$. Given the inequalities in (5), it is easy to see that the bound is attained if and only if both $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ are optimal anticodes, which occurs precisely when $\mathcal{C}$ is an optimal anticode by Theorem 54. □

6 Matrices with given rank and h-trace

In this section we apply Corollary 33, i.e., the MacWilliams identities for Delsarte codes, to classical problems in enumerative combinatorics, deriving a recursive formula for the number of $k \times m$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with prescribed rank and h-trace.

Definition 56. Let $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$, and let $1 \leq h \leq \min\{k, m\}$ be an integer. The **h-trace** of M is defined by

$$\mathrm{Tr}_h(M) := \sum_{i=1}^{h} M_{ii}.$$

Remark 57. Since for any matrix M we have $\mathrm{Tr}_h(M) = \mathrm{Tr}_h(M^t)$, without loss of generality in the following we only treat the case $k \leq m$. Notice also that when $k = m$ we have $\mathrm{Tr}_k(M) = \mathrm{Tr}(M)$. Hence the h-trace generalizes the trace of a matrix.

Notation 58. Given integers $1 \leq k \leq m$, $0 \leq r \leq k$ and $1 \leq h \leq k$, we denote by $n_q(k \times m, r, h)$ the number of matrices $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(M) = r$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_h(M) = 0$. We also denote by $n_q(k \times m, r, 0)$ the number of matrices in $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ of rank r.

Lemma 59. Let $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$ be integers. We have

$$n_q(k \times m, r, 0) = \begin{bmatrix} m \\ r \end{bmatrix} \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^k - q^i).$$

Sketch of proof. For a given vector subspace $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^m$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U) = r$, the number of matrices $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ whose row space equals U is precisely the number of full-rank $r \times k$ matrices, which is $\prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(q^k - q^i)$. The thesis follows from the fact that the number of subspaces $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^m$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(U) = r$ is $\begin{bmatrix} m \\ r \end{bmatrix}$. □

Remark 60. We notice that if one has the number of matrices in $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ of rank r and zero h-trace, then he can also determine the number of matrices in $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ of rank r and h-trace equal to α, for any α in $\mathbb{F}_q$. Since the number of $k \times m$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of rank r is given by Lemma 59, this fact is trivial when $q = 2$. On the other hand, if $q > 2$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ are non-zero elements of $\mathbb{F}_q$, then the map $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ defined by $M \mapsto \alpha^{-1}\beta M$ gives a bijection between the rank r matrices with h-trace equal to α and the rank r matrices with h-trace equal to β. It follows that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$ the number of matrices in $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with rank r and h-trace equal to α is

$$\frac{n_q(k \times m, r, 0) - n_q(k \times m, r, h)}{q - 1},$$

where $n_q(k \times m, r, 0)$ is explicitly given by Lemma 59.

Remark 61. The usual way of computing $n_q(k \times k, k, k)$ involves the Bruhat decomposition of $\mathrm{GL}_k(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and the theory of q-analogues (see [24], Proposition 1.10.15). A different approach proposed in [16] is based on Gauss sums over finite fields and properties of the Borel subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_k(\mathbb{F}_q)$. In [2] Buckheister derived a recursive description for $n_q(k \times k, r, k)$ using an elementary argument, and in [1] Bender applied the results of [2] to provide a closed formula for $n_q(k \times k, r, k)$. As Stanley observed ([24], page 100), the description of [2] is quite complicated. The following Theorem 62 provides a new recursive formula for the numbers $n_q(k \times m, r, h)$ which easily follows from Corollary 33. An explicit version of the same formula can be found in Appendix A.

Theorem 62. Let $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $1 \leq h \leq k$ be integers. For all $0 \leq r \leq k$ the numbers $n_q(r,h) := n_q(k \times m, r, h)$ are recursively computed by the following formulas.

$$n_q(r,h) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 0, \\ q^{mr-1}\left(\begin{bmatrix} k \\ r \end{bmatrix} + (q-1) \begin{bmatrix} k-h \\ r \end{bmatrix} \right) - \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} n_q(j,h) \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ r-j \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } 1 \leq r \leq k-h, \\ q^{mr-1} \begin{bmatrix} k \\ r \end{bmatrix} - \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} n_q(j,h) \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ r-j \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } k-h+1 \leq r \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We fix $1 \leq h \leq k$. Let $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be the matrix defined by

$$M_{ij} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \leq h, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{C} := \langle M \rangle \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be the Delsarte code generated by M over $\mathbb{F}_q$. It is easy to check that for any matrix $N \in \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ we have $\mathrm{Tr}_h(N) = \mathrm{Tr}(MN^t) = \langle M, N \rangle$. As a consequence, the set of matrices in $\mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with zero h-trace is precisely $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. Hence, we have $n_q(r,h) = B_r$ for all $0 \leq r \leq k$, where $(B_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. If $(A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes the rank distribution of $\mathcal{C}$, then we clearly have $A_0 = 1$, $A_h = q-1$, and $A_i = 0$ for $i \notin \{0, h\}$. The theorem now follows from Corollary 33. □

Example 63. Let $q = 4$, $k = 3$, $m = 4$. Theorem 33 allows us to compute all the values of $n_4(3 \times 4, r, h)$ as in Table 1.

	$r=0$	$r=1$	$r=2$	$r=3$
$h=1$	1	2283	381780	3810240
$h=2$	1	1515	336468	3856320
$h=3$	1	132	337428	3855552

Table 1: Values of $n_4(3 \times 4, r, h)$.

Conclusions

In this paper we prove that the duality theory of linear Delsarte codes generalizes the duality theory of linear Gabidulin codes. The relation between the two duality theories is described through trace-orthogonal bases of finite fields. We also give an elementary proof of MacWilliams identities for the general case of Delsarte codes, and show how to employ them to re-establish in a very concise way the main results of the theory of rank-metric codes. This also proves that MacWilliams identities may be taken as a starting point for the theory of rank-metric codes. We also investigate optimal Delsarte anticodes, and characterize them in terms of MRD codes. Finally, we show an application of our results solving a problem in enumerative combinatorics in an elementary way.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Elisa Gorla and to the Referees for many useful suggestions that improved the presentation of the paper.

A Explicit form of Theorem 31 and 62

Using known properties of binomial coefficients one can show that Theorem 31 implies Theorem 3.3 of [6] as an easy corollary. The following result, first proved by Delsarte using the theory of association schemes, may be regarded as the explicit version of Theorem 31.

Theorem 64. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}(k \times m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ be a code. Let $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the rank distributions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, respectively. We have

$$B_j = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|}\sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \sum_{s=0}^{k} (-1)^{j-s} q^{ms+\binom{j-s}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ s \end{bmatrix}$$

for $j = 0, ..., k$.

Proof. Throughout this proof the rows and columns of matrices are labeled from 0 to k for convenience (instead of from 1 to $k+1$). Define the matrix $P \in \mathrm{Mat}(k+1 \times k+1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ by

$$P_{ji} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|}\sum_{s=0}^{k} (-1)^{j-s} q^{ms+\binom{j-s}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k-i \\ s \end{bmatrix}$$

for $j, i \in \{0, ..., k\}$. We can write the statement in matrix form as $(B_0, ..., B_k)^t = P \cdot (A_0, ..., A_k)^t$. Define matrices $S, T \in \mathrm{Mat}(k+1 \times k+1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ by

$$S_{ij} := \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ i-j \end{bmatrix}, \qquad T_{ij} := \frac{q^{mi}}{|\mathcal{C}|} \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ i \end{bmatrix}$$

for $i, j \in \{0, ..., k\}$. We notice that S is invertible, since it is lower-triangular and $S_{ii} = 1$ for $i = 0, ..., k$. Theorem 31 reads $S \cdot (B_1, ..., B_k)^t = T \cdot (A_0, ..., A_k)^t$, i.e., $(B_1, ..., B_k)^t = S^{-1}T \cdot (A_0, ..., A_k)^t$. Hence it suffices to prove $P = S^{-1}T$, i.e., $T = SP$. Fix arbitrary integers $i, j \in \{0, ..., k\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (SP)_{ij} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|}\sum_{r=0}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} k-r \\ i-r \end{bmatrix} \sum_{s=0}^{k} (-1)^{r-s} q^{ms+\binom{r-s}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-r \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ s \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|}\sum_{s=0}^{k} q^{ms} \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ s \end{bmatrix} \sum_{r=0}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} k-r \\ i-r \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{r-s} q^{\binom{r-s}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-r \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{bmatrix} k-r \\ i-r \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k-r \\ k-i \end{bmatrix},$$

and using the definition of Gaussian binomial coefficient one finds

$$\begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-r \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k-r \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i-s \\ r-s \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} k-r \\ i-r \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{r-s} q^{\binom{r-s}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-r \end{bmatrix} &= \sum_{r=0}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i-s \\ r-s \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{r-s} q^{\binom{r-s}{2}} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} \sum_{r=0}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} i-s \\ r-s \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{r-s} q^{\binom{r-s}{2}} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} \sum_{r=-s}^{k-s} \begin{bmatrix} i-s \\ r \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{r} q^{\binom{r}{2}} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} \sum_{r=0}^{i-s} \begin{bmatrix} i-s \\ r \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{r} q^{\binom{r}{2}} \\
&= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the q-Binomial Theorem ([24], page 74). It follows

$$(SP)_{ij} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} q^{mi} \begin{bmatrix} k-j \\ i \end{bmatrix} = T_{ij},$$

as claimed. □

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 62 and replacing Corollary 33 with Theorem 64 we easily obtain the following explicit version of Theorem 62.

Theorem 65. Let $1 \leq k \leq m$, $1 \leq h \leq k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$ be integers. The number of $k \times m$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q$ having rank r and zero h-trace is

$$n_q(k \times m, r, h) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{s=0}^{k} (-1)^{r-s} q^{ms + \binom{r-s}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} k-s \\ k-r \end{bmatrix} \left(\begin{bmatrix} k \\ s \end{bmatrix} + (q-1) \begin{bmatrix} k-h \\ s \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Remark 66. Theorem 65 generalizes the works cited in Remark 61.

References

[1] E. A. Bender, *On Buckhiesters enumeration of $n \times n$ matrices*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, 17 (1974), pp. 273 – 274.

[2] P. G. Buckhiester, *The number of $n \times n$ matrices of rank r and trace α over a finite field*, Duke Mathematical Journal, 39 (1972), pp. 695 – 699.

[3] P. Camion, *Codes and association schemes*. In V. S. Pless and W. C. Huffman (editors), Handbook of Coding Theory, Vol. II, pp. 1441 – 1566. Elsevier (1998).

[4] P. Delsarte, *An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory*. Philips Research Report, Supplement, 10 (1973).

[5] P. Delsarte, *Association schemes and t-designs in regular semilattices*. Journal of Combinatoria Theory, Series A, 20 (1976), pp. 230 – 243.

[6] P. Delsarte, *Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory*. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, 25 (1978), 3, pp. 226 – 241.

[7] P. Delsarte, V. Levenshtein, *Association schemes and coding theory*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 44 (1988), pp. 2477 –2504.

[8] J. G. Dumas, R. Gow, G. McGuire, J. Sheekey, *Subspaces of matrices with special rank properties*. Linear Algebra and Its Applications, 433 (2010), pp. 191 – 202.

[9] E. Gabidulin *Theory of codes with maximum rank distance*. Problems of Information Transmission, 1 (1985), 2, pp. 1 – 12.

[10] M. Gadouleau, Z. Yan *MacWilliams Identities for the Rank Metric*. ISIT 2007 (Nice, France), pp. 36 – 40.

[11] M. Gadouleau, Z. Yan, *MacWilliams identity for Codes with the Rank Metric*. EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking, 2008.

[12] H. Gluesing-Luerssen, *Fourier-reflexive partitions and MacWilliams identities for additive codes*. Designs, Codes and Cryptography (to appear). Preprint available at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1304.1207.pdf`.

[13] D. Grant, M. Varanasi, *Duality theory for space-time codes over finite fields*. Advances in Mathematics of Communications, 2 (2005), 1, pp. 35 – 54.

[14] D. Grant, M. Varanasi, *Weight enumerators and a MacWilliams-type identity for space-time rank codes over finite fields*. Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (2005), pp. 2137 – 2146.

[15] R. Kötter, F. R. Kschischang, *Coding for Errors and Erasures in Random Network Coding*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 54 (2008), 8, pp. 3579 – 3591.

[16] Y. Li, S. Hu, *Gauss sums over some matrix groups*. Journal of Number Theory, 132 (2012), 12, pp. 2967 – 2976.

[17] F. J. MacWilliams, *A Theorem on the Distribution of Weights in a Systematic Code*. Bell System Technical Journal, 42 (1963), 1, pp. 79 – 94.

[18] F. J. MacWilliams, N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. North Holland Mathematical Library.

[19] R. Lidl, H. Niederreiter, *Finite Fields*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company (1983).

[20] D. Jungnickel, A. J. Menezes, S. A. Vanston, *The number of self-dual bases of $GF(q^m)$ over $GF(q)$*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 109 (1990), 1, pp. 23-29.

[21] D. Silva, F. R. Kschishang, *On metrics for error correction in network coding*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 55 (2009), 12, pp. 5479 – 5490.

[22] D. Silva, F. R. Kschischang, *Universal Secure Network Coding via Rank-Metric Codes*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 57 (2011), 2, pp. 1124 – 1135.

[23] D. Silva, E. S. Rogers, F. R. Kschishang, R. Koetter, *A Rank-Metric Approach to Error Control in Random Network Coding*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 54 (2008), 9, pp. 3951 – 3967.

[24] P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics*, vol. 1, second ed., Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math., vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2012).